

Applicant : Gary G. Liu
Serial No. : 09/747,763
Filed : December 21, 2000
Page : 7 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 18513-003001

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated July 26, 2005, Applicant has amended claims 1-2, 9-10 and 12-13 so as to further clarify the claimed invention. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in Figs. 1a and 1b, and their corresponding section(s) of the specification. No new matter has been entered.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1-16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over USP No. 6,233,565 to Lewis in view of USP No. 6,225,995 to Jacobs. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in-part that an user terminal is operable to compute a hash value of a particular file ... and uses a URL containing the hash value to retrieve from a server computer, in a single authentication communication with the server computer, a web page that contains information about the file.

With respect to claim 1, in the Amendment filed March 28, 2005, Applicant argued, "...Lewis requires multiple authentication contacts with the server (see, page 7, lines 10-11 of Amendment)." In response, the Examiner asserted, "... in an initial authentication

Applicant : Gary G. Liu
Serial No. : 09/747,763
Filed : December 21, 2000
Page : 8 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 18513-003001

communication with a server computer, the communication itself may comprise multiple communications.”

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with such interpretation, because the pending claims expressly recite *an* initial authentication communication. That said, Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly indicate that the communication is a *single* communication, rather than multiple communications as alleged.

As discussed in the previous Amendment, the claimed authentication communication can obtain electronic records without previous set-up. In contrast, Lewis requires *multiple* authentication contacts with the server (i.e., registration, authentication, and scanning). In particular, Lewis discloses scanning a receipt after it has been digitally signed. However, the Lewis receipt cannot be generated without first obtaining a key pair from the server. Furthermore, the key pair disclosed in Lewis is obtained after a registration process involving a password so that multiple communications are warranted.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Lewis does not disclose or suggest a single authentication communication, as recited in claim 1. Jacob fails to cure this deficiency of Lewis, because the server disclosed in Jacob, in tracking states across multiple-request operations, inherently requires multiple communications.

Further, in the previous Amendment, Applicant submitted detailed arguments for the patentability of the rejected claims, and argued, “... Lewis teaches away from the claimed user terminal.” Applicant stated that the claimed user terminal computes a hash and retrieves electronic records, while Lewis discloses using separate entities for digitally signing a receipt

Applicant : Gary G. Liu
Serial No. : 09/717,763
Filed : December 21, 2000
Page : 9 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 18513-003001

and scanning a receipt. Further details can be found, for example, at page 7, 2nd paragraph to page 8, 1st paragraph of previous Amendment.

However, it does not appear that the Examiner has addressed the foregoing distinction(s) provided by the Applicant. Accordingly, without a new rejection or response to the arguments from the Examiner, the deficiencies of the pending rejections as previously argued in the amendment filed March 28, 2005 are still a valid basis for the patentability of claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

As a final note, if the pending rejection is maintained, it is respectfully requested that the foregoing arguments be addressed in the next Office Action so as to afford the Applicant an opportunity to respond to the concerns raised therein.

With respect to claims 2, 9-10 and 12-13, as these claims also recite the claimed features "a single authentication communication" and/or "user terminal," it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 9-10 and 12-13 are patentable over the cited prior art for reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

III. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The Independent Claims From Which They Depend Are Allowable

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplicatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as

Applicant : Gary G. Liu
Serial No. : 09/747,763
Filed : December 21, 2000
Page : 10 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 18513-003001

independent claims 1-2, 9-10 and 12-13 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.


If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

4/17/05



Alex Chan
Reg. No. 52,713

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50295896.doc